

The Queen's Award to Industry

In announcing the scheme in the House of Commons on 4th February 1965, the Prime Minister explained that the purpose of the Awards was to recognise outstanding achievement by industrial units, and we have therefore regarded our terms of reference as requiring us to devise a scheme for the making of awards to organisations and not to individuals.

NATURE AND FORM OF THE AWARD

2. The purpose of the scheme is to recognise outstanding achievement by industry either in increasing exports or in technological innovation. We therefore recommend that the Award should cover achievement either in exports or in technology or in a combination of both. We conceive the Award as recognising various aspects of industrial efficiency and we recommend that it should be related to the production of goods by any branch of British industry, including agriculture and horticulture. We suggest as an appropriate title The Queen's Award to Industry.

3. The Award signifies recognition by the Sovereign of striking achievement and we recommend that it should be represented by an emblem which the holder of the Award should be authorised to display in a wide variety of ways consistent with the dignity of an emblem signifying a Royal connection. We recommend that the design attached to our Report should be adopted. It has been designed so as to be capable of being rendered in colour and in black and white as well as flat and in relief in order that it may be displayed on flags, plaques, note-paper, packaging, and goods themselves. We recommend that a manual should be prepared to instruct Award holders on the correct forms for the display of the emblem in these applications.

NUMBER OF AWARDS

4. The success of the scheme as an incentive will rest primarily on setting and maintaining the highest standards for achievement. The number of Awards made each year will therefore be strictly limited; experience in the operation of the scheme may suggest the need for fixing an annual maximum.

CURRENCY OF THE AWARDS

5. We have considered whether the right to display the emblem of the Award should lapse on the expiry of a stated period, and have concluded that initially it should do so after five years. To encourage those who hold Awards to continue to seek recognition, we suggest that the year of the individual Award should appear on the emblem in those forms of display where it would be legible. During the five years of the currency of an Award the holder would also be entitled to display dated emblems signifying any earlier Awards.

FREQUENCY AND TIMING OF ANNOUNCEMENTS OF AWARDS

6. A fixed day for the announcement of Awards would have the advantage of attracting public interest and is therefore to be preferred to the

announcement of individual Awards whenever particular claims have been considered. This arrangement would make it easier to compare claims and would encourage a healthy spirit of competition. We therefore recommend that Awards should be announced on a single date in each year. Her Majesty has consented to this date being her actual birthday, 21st April. We suggest that the first announcement of Award winners might be made on 21st April 1966, and that the first Awards should run from this date.

METHOD OF PRESENTATION

7. We think it preferable that the Award should be presented at the premises of the industrial unit to which it is given. As the Awards are for collective effort a local ceremony would permit participation by all the individuals who have played their part in the achievement, whatever their jobs. We recommend, therefore, that the presentation, which might take the form of handing over a Document of Appointment and some representation of the emblem, should normally be made by the Lord Lieutenant of the County as the Queen's representative.

IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATES

8. We recommend that industrial concerns should be invited to apply for the Award. In the absence of detailed information about the export sales performance of individual firms, or records of their export or technological standards, units who might deserve an Award could be overlooked. We have noted that, no doubt for this reason, somewhat similar schemes in the United States of America and in France provide for direct application. We have also in mind that competition between industrial concerns would be stimulated if they could themselves apply for the Award and that this would in itself encourage deliberate efforts to develop the business of an organisation so that its record would support a strong claim.

ELIGIBILITY OF INDUSTRIAL UNITS

9. We recognise that the purpose of making Awards to particular industrial units was to avoid giving credit to the whole of a very large firm or a nationalised industry, only part of which had been responsible for the achievement which had earned recognition. Nevertheless, units other than the unit immediately responsible for the achievement that earns an Award will often be able to claim credit as well; and we recommend that when appropriate these units should also be entitled to display the emblem of the Award. When the achievement has resulted from the co-operation of a number of units within a concern, each unit should qualify. It will no doubt be necessary to work in consultation with the headquarters of a concern in identifying the particular unit or units which would be entitled to display the emblem.

10. We do not intend to exclude from consideration bodies whose activities conform with the terms of the scheme as a whole even though they are not industrial units in the conventional sense. We therefore recommend that units or agencies of central or local government with industrial functions, as well as research associations, educational institutions and bodies of a similar character should be eligible provided they can show they have contributed to industrial efficiency in the fields with which the scheme is concerned.

11. We recommend that the Award should be made for industrial efficiency, assessed in terms of achievements such as :—

- (i) A substantial and sustained increase in total exports over a period of three years.
- (ii) A substantial and sustained increase in the percentage of total export sales to total business over a period of three years.
- (iii) A percentage of exports to total business which is considerably and consistently higher than the average for the applicant's sector of industry.
- (iv) A spectacular increase over a shorter period than three years where there is a reasonable prospect that the performance can be maintained.
- (v) A breakthrough in a particularly difficult market.
- (vi) The greatest value of export sales by any group or company in a given year.
- (vii) A significant advance in the application of advanced technology to a production or development process in British industry. Recognition should only be accorded under this head if greater efficiency results from the process.
- (viii) The production for sale of goods which incorporate new and advanced technological qualities.

In respect of (vii) and (viii) credit would be given for earnings from royalties and manufacturing licences, and fees from designs, particularly when received from abroad.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR EXPORT ACHIEVEMENT

12. Export achievement should be based on visible exports, including where appropriate construction work by British companies overseas.

13. In recommending that achievement should be assessed over a three year period both for the initial Award and its renewal, we have had it in mind that Awards should normally recognise a sustained increase in the value of exports by an industrial unit. We expect that this would usually be an absolute increase but we recognise that there may be cases in which a firm's performance might be more fairly expressed as a percentage of total turnover ; or in some cases as a percentage of the turnover of the classes of goods which a unit exports, where for any reason certain of its products are not by their nature exportable.

14. We would not wish to overlook the achievement of firms whose performance is outstanding but whose export sales are already so high as to leave little scope for improvement. Difficulties may also arise in comparing the efforts of units of different size and in distinguishing between the different conditions facing different industries. We hope that these problems may be resolved in part by the measurement of exports by a particular industrial unit either against its total turnover or its turnover in those of its products which can be exported, or by comparison of its export performance with that of other units in the same industry.

15. We feel that quality of effort should be taken into account as well as overall success. For this reason we recommend that credit should be given, for example, for the successful introduction of a new product into export trade, or for maintaining sales in a market where conditions are exceptionally hard, or for other meritorious features of sales performance to which firms draw attention. We suggest, however, that achievements of this kind should only be regarded as justification for an Award when they form part of a good general exporting record.

16. In some cases, sales performance alone may be sufficient evidence of industrial efficiency in the export field. In others, the consideration would be a high sales performance combined with general excellence in exporting skills. We therefore recommend that special measures taken to stimulate exports should be taken into account and credit given for the quality of a unit's organisation for exporting. Information on this score would be valuable in distinguishing between the performance of firms whose sales records are otherwise similar.

17. No appraisal of export achievement would be complete which left out of reckoning the quality and reliability of the goods which are the subject of a unit's export sales performance. While a continually improving performance would be *prima facie* evidence that quality and reliability had been maintained, we recommend that arrangements should be made, perhaps by enquiry through the Commercial Departments of British Embassies and High Commissions, to ensure that there is no record of failure in either of these two respects which would in any way detract from the esteem in which we hope the Award will be held in our export markets.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION

18. We recommend that the objective of the scheme should be to further the practical application of scientific research and development. The technological criteria set out in paragraph 11 have been formulated with this intention. We do not recommend that inventors or inventions should be recognised as such. The scheme should concentrate on the practical application in industry of advanced technology whether in the form of processes or of products. We do not, of course, intend to detract in any way from the efforts of inventors but for whom innovation would be impossible. We feel, however, that the scheme should make a contribution to countering the charge that we as a country sometimes fail in the industrial exploitation of our own national inventiveness.

19. In making the qualification "for sale" in paragraph 11(viii) we have in mind that Awards should be confined to finished products or processes resulting from or involved in the normal course of commercial production. We intend this to cover both mass-produced and custom-built goods. This would include specialised equipment produced on a "one-off" basis, but we advise against extending recognition to products or processes which are still in a stage of development and are not yet fully integrated into a viable industrial operation.

20. We have stipulated under (vii) of paragraph 11 that before recognition can be considered, the introduction of the significantly advanced technological process must lead to greater efficiency. At the same time, while

we realise that productive efficiency resulting from good management or from the abolition of restrictive practices is of the highest importance, we do not consider that this type of achievement should by itself constitute a qualification.

21. We recommend that the emphasis should be on current technological innovation; but technological achievement in the recent past should not be ruled out of consideration when it has a special relevance to today's technological developments.

22. It is perhaps even more difficult to prescribe qualifications for technological innovation than it is for export achievement and we realise that the selectors will have to exercise discretion within the guide-lines set out above. Moreover, in formulating the qualifications for exports, we have had the advantage of being able to draw on the experience of other countries which are already operating export award schemes; but in the case of technology we shall be breaking new ground.

SELECTION PROCEDURES

23. Recommendations for the Award will be made to the Queen by the Prime Minister. To assist him there should be a small Committee composed of members from both within and outside the Government Service, which would draw upon advice from outside its membership as necessary. This Committee, we suggest, should be served by two subordinate committees under the aegis of the Board of Trade and Ministry of Technology which would respectively advise on the export and the technological aspects of applications.

RULES GOVERNING THE AWARD

24. We are advised that it would be appropriate to embody the rules governing the Award and the use of the emblem in a Royal Warrant which would institute the Award. We understand that for administrative reasons Awards should be made to legal entities such as Companies or Boards; but the Warrant should provide that the title to the use of the emblem may where appropriate be restricted to part only of an organisation.

PROVISION FOR REVIEW

25. We recommend that the working of the Award Scheme as presented in our Report should be reviewed after five years so that any modifications which practical experience of its operation had shown to be desirable could be introduced.

August 1965





THE DESIGN OF THE EMBLEM

The emblem of the Award has been designed by
Abram Games, OBE, RDI, FSIA.

It is reproduced on the front cover in the colours
to be specified for use on flags.



THE DESIGN OF THE EMBLEM WITH DARK BACKGROUND

THE QUEEN'S AWARD TO INDUSTRY

Report by a Committee
under the Chairmanship of
H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh



LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
1965

The Committee

His Royal Highness the Prince

Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, KG, KT, *Chairman*

Sir William Carron

Major-General C. H. Colquhoun, CB, CVO, OBE

Sir Maurice Dean, KCB, KCMG

Sir Laurence Helsby, GCB, KBE

Lord Kings Norton

Sir Maurice Laing

Sir William McFadzean

Brigadier C. E. Morrison, DSO, MC

Mr. L. K. O'Brien

Sir Richard Powell, KCB, KBE, CMG

Sir Peter Runge

Joint Secretaries: Mr. L. Reid

Mr. J. C. Y. de Pauley

Terms of reference: The Committee was asked to draw up a scheme for awards to industry, to be made by The Sovereign, for outstanding achievement either in increasing exports or in technological innovation.

The Committee is indebted to Sir Duncan Oppenheim (*Chairman*) and Mr. Paul Reilly (*Director*) of the Council of Industrial Design, and to Sir Anthony Wagner, KCVO, Garter Principal King of Arms, for advice on certain matters relating to the design of the emblem.